



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE HEBREW IDEA OF THE FUTURE LIFE

PROFESSOR LEWIS BAYLES PATON, PH.D., D.D.
Hartford Theological Seminary, Hartford, Conn.

V. YAHWEH'S RELATION TO THE DEAD IN THE LATER HEBREW RELIGION

In the preceding article,¹ we saw how prophetism in its polemic against ancestor-worship destroyed belief in the primitive Semitic doctrine of spirits. From the time of Moses down to the completion of the canon of the Law about 400 B.C. the attitude of the Old Testament religion toward immortality was increasingly negative, until at last existence in Sheol was so stripped of content that it became practically equivalent to annihilation. If it was not eternal death, it was at least eternal sleep. During this entire period, however, another movement of thought was going on that was destined in a later age to create a new belief in immortality. This concerned itself with the problem of rewards and punishments. This problem called forth in ancient Israel a succession of theories that deserve our detailed consideration.

1. *The theory of collective retribution.*—The early Hebrews brought into Canaan as an inheritance from primitive Semitic times a strong sense of the solidarity of the family and of the clan. Tribes were spoken of in the singular, as Israel, Moab, Ammon, and the identity of the individual was lost in the group. The logical corollary of this conception was the assumption of collective responsibility for the sins of individuals. Saul sought to kill David's relatives on his account (I Sam. 22:1, 3 f.), and annihilated the clan of Ahimelech the priest because he had befriended David (I Sam. 22:16). David proposed to cut off the entire family of Nabal because of the insolence of the head of the house (I Sam. 25:22). The seven sons of Saul were hanged because of his attack on the Gibeonites (II Sam. 21:6 ff.). The sons of Naboth were slain with him (II Kings 9:26).

¹ *Biblical World*, April, 1910.

It seemed eminently natural, accordingly, to the ancient Hebrew that Yahweh should deal with the group rather than the individual, and should bring the punishment of the sinner, or the reward of the righteous, upon his family, his clan, or his nation, rather than upon himself. Yahweh visited the penalty of the fathers upon the children, upon the third and upon the fourth generation of them that hated him (Exod. 20:5). The Canaanites were enslaved because of the guilt of their remote ancestor (Gen. 9:24 f.). Pharaoh and his house were plagued because he had taken Sarah (Gen. 12:17 J). The wombs of the house of Abimelech were closed for the same offense (Gen. 20:18 E). The firstborn of Egypt were smitten for the sin of Pharaoh (Exod. 12:29 J). Amalek was destroyed because its forefathers attacked Israel (Exod. 17:16; I Sam. 15:2 f.). Dathan and Abiram were engulfed with their wives, their sons, and their little ones (Num. 16:27 ff. JE). Achan was slain with his sons and his daughters, his oxen and his asses, his sheep and all that he had (Josh. 7:24 J). The sin of Eli was visited upon his descendants (I Sam. 2:31). The blood of Abner fell upon the father's house of Joab (II Sam. 3:29). David's child was killed and the sword never departed from his house because of his sin (II Sam. 12:10, 14 f.). Solomon was told, "I will surely rend the kingdom from thee Notwithstanding in thy days I will not do it, for David thy father's sake; but I will rend it out of the hand of thy son" (I Kings 11:11 f.). The house of Jeroboam was cursed for the sin of its founder (I Kings 14:10), so also that of Baasha (I Kings 16:3), and of Ahab (I Kings 21:21). The early prophets held the same conception. Amos announced as the punishment of Amaziah, "Thy wife shall be a harlot in the city, and thy sons and thy daughters shall fall by the sword" (Amos 7:17). These prophets always asserted that the penalty due the ruling classes should fall upon the nation as a whole (cf. Amos 8:8; Hos. 3:4; Isa. 5:25-30; Mic. 3:12). In like manner the rewards of virtue accrued to the family of the righteous (Gen. 7:1 J; 19:12 J; II Sam. 6:11; I Kings 11:12; Deut. 1:36).²

Faith in this primitive theory of retribution was shaken by the advent of a new social order in Israel. In the period of the monarchy, through trade and life in cities, the ancient tribal organization began

² See Löhr, *Socialismus u. Individualismus im A. T.*

to break up, and a new importance was attached to the individual. This shows itself in the social legislation of Deuteronomy and the Holiness Code (Lev., chaps. 17-26), both promulgated shortly before the Exile, in contrast to the Book of the Covenant and early Hebrew custom. The rights of women in divorce are guarded by Deut. 24:1 f. Female slaves are granted the same right of redemption as male slaves (Deut. 15:12; cf. Exod. 21:7), and it is forbidden to return a runaway slave to his owner (Deut. 23:15 f.). By the Holiness Code (Lev. 25:42) all enslavement of Hebrews is prohibited. In Deut. 20:5-8; 24:5 a number of circumstances are enumerated under which an individual is exempt from military service. The right of parents to offer their children in sacrifice is no longer recognized (Deut. 12:31; 18:10; Lev. 18:21), and it is forbidden to put children to death for the crimes of their fathers, or fathers for the crimes of children (Deut. 24:16; cf. the editorial passage in II Kings 14:6).

Individualism was fostered also by the religion of the prophets. In their inaugural visions they were conscious of a personal communion with Yahweh that did not depend upon the fact that they were members of the commonwealth of Israel. The nation was against them, yet their confidence was unshaken that they had stood in the council of the Most High. This experience was exemplified most perfectly in Jeremiah, whose faith in God's individual care for his saints triumphed amid the downfall of the nation (Jer. 1:17-19; 17:5-18; 20:7-11), and led him to assert that in the coming age Yahweh would write his instruction in the heart of each individual, so that all should know him from the least unto the greatest (Jer. 31:31-34). This doctrine was taken up by Ezekiel, and found magnificent expression in the words, "Behold, all souls are mine; as the soul of the father, so also the soul of the son is mine" (Ezek. 18:4). The fall of Jerusalem and the breaking of the ancient national and tribal bonds through the Exile fostered this religious individualism, so that in post-exilic times it became a characteristic feature of Judaism that finds constant expression in the Psalter.

This new conception of the worth of the individual could not fail to suggest difficulties in the ancient theory of collective retribution. If, as the prophets were never weary of asserting, Yahweh was supremely righteous, why did he not punish the sinners themselves,

instead of visiting their penalty upon their children, their clan, or their nation? In the time of Jeremiah popular discontent with the old doctrine found expression in the proverb, "The fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the children's teeth are blunted" (Jer. 31:29), a saying which implies that the divine government is unjust, and that therefore moral effort is useless. Ezekiel found the same proverb current among the exiles in Babylonia (Ezek. 18:2), who claimed that, although they were innocent, they were suffering the penalty of the sins of their forefathers. The same difficulty is voiced in Job 21:19 ff.: "Ye say, God layeth up his penalty for his children. Let him recompense it unto himself, that he may know it. Let his own eyes see his destruction, and let him drink of the wrath of the Almighty. For what pleasure hath he in his house after him, when the number of his months is cut off in the midst?" The cardinal doctrine of prophetism, the righteousness of Yahweh, was thus at stake, and it became necessary for Hebrew thinkers to formulate a new theory of retribution.

2. *The theory of individual retribution in the present life.*—Ezekiel met the problem of his age by a bold repudiation of the ancient postulate of solidarity in guilt. Instead of the doctrine that the penalty of the fathers is visited upon the children, he taught, "The soul that sinneth it shall die" (Ezek. 18:4), and amplified this proposition at great length to show that each man received separately the reward of his own deeds (Ezek. 18:5-32; 9:3-6; 14:12-20). This recompense was, of course, in the present life, since Ezekiel, like the other prophets, held that there was no conscious existence in Sheol. This theory found great favor with Ezekiel's successors, and was defended by most of the Psalms, the Proverbs, and Ecclesiasticus (cf. Ps. 34:19 ff.; 37:25, 28; 145:20; Prov. 3:33; 11:31; Eccclus. 9:12; 12:2 f.). It was also the theory of the three friends who argued against Job (Job 4:8; 8:20; 11:20).

In spite of its popularity, however, this theory was open to formidable objections. In the first place, experience taught that there was truth in the old theory of collective guilt. The children of the drunken and the sensual bore the consequences of their fathers' excesses, while the children of the godly entered into an inheritance of health and prosperity. Ezekiel's message of individual responsi-

bility and individual retribution was only a half-truth; and, in the extreme form in which he stated it, could not be made to square with the facts of life. It is no wonder, therefore, that the old doctrine that the sins of the fathers were visited upon the children maintained itself in Jewish thought even down into New Testament times (Job 5:4; 17:5; 20:10; 27:14 f.; Ps. 109:9-15; Dan. 9:7-16; Tob. 3:3; Judith 7:28; Bar. 1:15-21; 2:26; 3:8; Matt. 23:35).

In the second place, it was contrary to experience that each man received in the present life the just recompense of his deeds. It was frequently observed that the sinners prospered, and the righteous suffered. Manasseh, the wickedest of all the kings of Judah, reigned in peace for fifty-five years; while Josiah, the reformer, was slain in the battle of Megiddo. Prophets like Jeremiah suffered everything at the hands of their contemporaries, and pious worshipers of Yahweh at the time of the captivity fared worse than apostate Israelites. Such facts as these cast doubts upon the doctrine of individual retribution: "Righteous art thou, O Yahweh, when I plead with thee; yet would I reason the cause with thee: Wherefore doth the way of the wicked prosper? Wherefore are all they at ease that deal very treacherously? Thou hast planted them, yea, they have taken root; they grow, yea, they bring forth fruit" (Jer. 12:1 f.; cf. Job 21:7-34; Ps. 22:1-21; 44:9-26; 73:1-16; Hab. 1:2-4, 13-17).

Defenders of Ezekiel's theory tried to answer this objection by asserting that the happiness of the wicked and the misery of the righteous are only temporary. In order to test the fidelity of his servants God permits injustice to exist for a while, but before the death of every man he will apportion a just recompense (Job 5:3, 18-27; 20:4 f.; Ps. 37:1 f., 7 f.; 73:18). Encouraged by this thought, Job's friends, the Psalms and the Proverbs, urge men, in the face of all apparent contradictions, to hold fast to the faith that God will reward the righteous and punish the wicked in the present life.

An inevitable consequence of this theory was the assumption that happiness is the measure of goodness. If a man were a great sufferer, and no change came in his fortunes, it must be assumed that he was a great sinner. This was the logic of Job's friends. In view of his unparalleled calamities, they could only conclude that he was the chief of sinners. At first they only insinuated this, hoping to lead him

to confession (Job 4:7; 8:3 ff.); but gradually, emboldened by what they regarded as his obstinacy, they openly accused him of secret sin (11:3-6). Job was conscious of innocence and indignantly repudiated their charges; still the fact remained that God afflicted him and other upright men. In view of this, he was forced to abandon the theory of individual retribution in the present life: "The just, the perfect man is a laughing-stock. . . . The tents of robbers prosper and they that provoke God are secure" (Job 12:4-6); "It is all one therefore, I say, he destroyeth the perfect and the wicked. If the scourge slay suddenly, he will mock at the calamity of the innocent. The earth is given into the hand of the wicked" (Job 9:22-24; cf. 10:3; 16:11-17; 19:6-21; 21:7-34; 27:2).

The same conclusion was reached by the author of Ecclesiastes: "One event happeneth to them all. Then said I in my heart, As it happeneth to the fool so will it happen even unto me" (Eccles. 2:14 f.); "There is a righteous man that perisheth in his righteousness, and there is a wicked man that prolongeth his life in his evil-doing" (7:15); "I saw the wicked buried, and they came to the grave; and they that had done right went away from the holy place, and were forgotten in the city" (8:10); "All things come alike to all: there is one event to the righteous and to the wicked, to the good and to the evil, to the clean and to the unclean, to him that sacrificeth and to him that sacrificeth not; as is the good, so is the sinner" (9:2).

3. *The theory of retribution through resurrection.*—While Job was struggling with the mystery of suffering, the question suddenly flashed into his mind, Was it not possible that a vindication of his innocence might come after death? That could not be in Sheol, since there conscious existence ceased, but might not God bring him back to life again, so that on earth and in the flesh he should receive the reward of virtue? The cut-down tree revives. May not man also awaken from the sleep of death?

There is hope for a tree, if it be cut down, that it will sprout again,
And that the tender branch thereof will not cease.
Though the root thereof wax old in the earth,
And the stock thereof die in the ground;
Yet through the scent of water it will bud,
And put forth boughs like a plant (Job 14:7-9).

At first the poet rejects the thought of resurrection as inconceivable.

But a man dieth, and is prostrate,
And a mortal expireth, and where is he?
As the water vanisheth from the sea,
And as the river drieth up and is arid,
So man lieth down, and doth not arise:
Till the heavens be no more, they shall not awake,
Nor be roused out of their sleep (14: 10-12).

But the new hope that has risen within him still asserts itself.

O that thou wouldest hide me in Sheol,
That thou wouldest conceal me until thy wrath should turn away,
That thou wouldest appoint me a set time and remember me.
If a man die, shall he live again?
All the days of my enlistment would I wait,
Till my discharge should come,
Till thou shouldest call, and I should answer thee,
Till thou shouldest long for the work of thy hands (14: 13-15).

The hope here expressed does not mount to the height of assertion, and the theme is not pursued farther at this point; but in 19:25-27 Job again returns to it, and this time states as a conviction what before had been only a vague longing.

But I know that my avenger liveth,
And one who shall survive after I am dust;
And that another shall arise as my witness,
And that he shall set up his mark.
From my flesh shall I see God,
Whom I shall see for myself,
And mine eyes shall behold, and no stranger.³

This cannot refer, as many commentators have supposed, to a vision of God in the other world, for Job has asserted too often his conviction that there is no knowledge in Sheol (Job 7:9; 14:21; 17:15 f.). It must be interpreted in the light of the hope that struggles to expression in 14:7-15, that there is such a thing as a return from Sheol to the life upon earth. "From my flesh," accordingly, cannot mean "disembodied," but must mean "re-embodied." The vindication of a disembodied spirit would be at variance with the whole development of Old Testament thought up to this point, while

³ Translated from the text as revised by Duhm on the basis of the Septuagint.

resurrection would not seem inconceivable to one who believed that Yahweh's power extended to Sheol (Job 11:8; 26:5 f.; 38:16 f.), and that at various times he had brought men back from the gates of death (I Kings 17:21 f.; II Kings 4:32 ff.; 13:21).

As we saw in a previous article,⁴ there is no evidence for the existence of a doctrine of resurrection among the Babylonians or among the pre-exilic Hebrews. The sudden emergence of this hope in the Book of Job may be due simply to the logical working of the author's mind upon the two tenets of prophetic theology, the righteousness of Yahweh and the lifelessness of Sheol; but it may also be due to direct or indirect influence of the Persian religion, in which the doctrine of resurrection was highly developed. By most recent critics the Book of Job is dated late in the Persian period, and it is certain that Persian ideas exerted an influence upon the eschatological conceptions of later Judaism.

The hope of an individual resurrection expressed by Job is extended to the righteous of Israel as a class by an apocalypse of the late Persian period in Isa., chaps. 24-27: "Thy dead shall arise; the inhabitants of the dust shall awake, and shout for joy; for a dew of lights is thy dew, and to life shall the earth bring the shades" (Isa. 26:19).⁵ This idea is based upon a literal interpretation of Ezekiel's vision of the valley of dead bones (Ezek., chap. 37). Here the raising of the dead army is only a symbol of the restoration of Judah, but in this apocalypse it is interpreted as a literal resurrection. According to this author, only the righteous rise, and it is not stated expressly that all of these are included. The wicked, who have oppressed Israel, are to remain in the dreamless sleep of Sheol: "They will be swept together as prisoners into a pit, and led down to be confined in a dungeon; thus after many days they will be punished" (24:22); "The dead will not live again, the shades will not rise; to that end thou didst punish them, thou didst destroy them, and cause all memory of them to perish" (26:14). Here Sheol appears, not as the common fate of all men, as in the pre-exilic period, but only as the punishment of the wicked, while the reward of the righteous is that they escape from Sheol, and participate in the messianic kingdom of

⁴ *Biblical World*, March, 1910, 169-71.

⁵ Emended text, according to Duhm and Cheyne.

the restored Israel. Through the rising of the righteous dead the numbers of the feeble Jewish community shall be increased, and it shall become a conquering power in the earth (26:15-18). Thus the eschatology of the individual is combined with the eschatology of the nation in a manner nowhere suggested in the Book of Job.

A further step in the doctrine of resurrection is taken in Daniel (165-164 B.C.): "And many that sleep in the land of dust shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt. And those that teach wisdom shall shine like the brightness of the firmament, and those that turn many to righteousness like the stars forever and ever" (Dan. 12:2 f.). Here not all the righteous are raised to everlasting life, but only "many," apparently the righteous priests and scribes who suffered martyrdom in the persecutions of Antiochus Epiphanes. Many of the wicked also are raised. The reason seems to be that the sleep of Sheol is not regarded as a sufficient penalty for them. Justice requires that they too shall come to life, in order that they may receive the "shame and everlasting contempt" that their sins deserve. The prophetic conception of death as existence without thought or feeling is still too strong to allow the author to think of either rewards or punishments in Sheol. Hence he must bring both the good and the bad back to earth, in order that they may receive the just recompense of their deeds.

The resurrection, which thus far has been asserted only for the conspicuously righteous, or the conspicuously wicked, is extended by later writings to all the dead. Thus in II Esd. 4:41 we read: "In the grave the chambers of souls are like the womb; for like as a woman that travaileth maketh haste to escape the anguish of the travail, even so do these places haste to deliver those things that are committed unto them from the beginning"; 7:32: "The earth shall restore those that are asleep in her, and so shall the dust those that dwell therein in silence, and the chambers shall deliver those souls that were committed unto them"; Enoch 51:1: "In those days shall the earth give back those that are gathered in her, and Sheol shall restore those it has received, and Abaddon shall render up what has been intrusted to it"; Apoc. Bar. 21:23: "May Sheol be sealed up henceforth, that it receive no more dead; and may the chambers of souls restore those that are shut up in them." This

general resurrection of all men, to receive the judgment of the last day, became the orthodox doctrine of the Pharisees and of the Talmud (Acts 23:6 ff.).

Through a return to life on earth, in which the righteous were rewarded and the wicked were punished, the problem of individual retribution received a fairly complete solution; nevertheless, some difficulties still remained. It did not seem entirely just that the righteous should suffer the temporary extinction of Sheol along with the wicked, even though they were raised again at the last day. Pious souls, who had known communion with God in this life, could not believe that he would leave them to the oblivion of Sheol for centuries before he would renew his fellowship with them. Moreover, those who were living when the last day came, or those who had died recently, enjoyed a great advantage over the ancient saints who were compelled to wait for ages before their release came. These considerations led in the Graeco-Roman period to the assertion of a larger vitality of disembodied spirits and to belief in a judgment that took place at death.

4. *The theory of retribution before resurrection.*—This doctrine first appears in the oldest portion of the Book of Enoch, chaps. 1-36,⁶ which some critics date as early as 170 B.C., but which others assign to the reign of John Hyrcanus (135-105 B.C.). In chap. 22 Sheol is described as containing four divisions, two for the wicked and two for the righteous. One contains the souls of the wicked who have received their punishment in this life. They shall remain there forever, and not be raised at the last day. The second contains the wicked who have not been punished in this life. "Here their spirits are placed apart in this great pain, till the day of judgment, and punishment, and torment of the accursed forever." The third contains the souls of the moderately righteous, who are free from pain, but who do not receive their reward until the resurrection. The fourth contains the great saints. These dwell already in Paradise, and drink of the water of life, while they await their resurrection.

In the Parables of Enoch (chaps. 37-71), which probably date from a time shortly before the beginning of the Christian era, the righteous pass at once after death into blessedness in the presence of

⁶ See Charles, *The Book of Enoch*; Kautzsch, *Apocryphen und Pseudepigraphen*.

God, and are guarded by the pre-existent "Son of Man" (Enoch 38:1; 40:5; 43:4; 49:3; 60:6; 61:12; 70:4). At the time of the coming of the "Son of Man" they are to be raised to life, in order that they may share in the blessedness of the messianic kingdom (51:1).

A similar conception appears in another independent section of the Book of Enoch (chaps. 102-4): "I swear to you now, ye righteous . . . that good of every sort, joy and honor, are prepared and recorded for the spirits of those who have died in righteousness. . . . Woe to you sinners, when ye die in your sins, and your comrades say of you, Blessed are the sinners. . . . Know ye not that their souls are brought down to Sheol, that they fare ill, and that their affliction will be great?" (Enoch 103:1 f.; compare also Apoc. Bar., chap. 30; II Esd., chap. 7).

In this development of the doctrine of retribution it is impossible not to recognize Greek influence. The theology of the Prophets and of the Law culminated in a denial of conscious existence in Sheol. Consequently, a belief in rewards or punishments in the other world was impossible on a purely Hebrew basis. Resurrection, with the final attendant judgment, was the only conception that was natural for a Jewish mind trained in the eschatology of the canonical Scriptures. On the other hand, the Greek philosophers had long since elaborated a theory of the immortality of the soul. Beginning with the Dionysiac cult in Thrace and the Orphic mysteries, and advancing through Pythagoras, the doctrine of divine kinship and inherent immortality of the human soul reached a high development. The movement culminated in Plato, who taught that the soul is an eternal, uncreated substance. In consequence of a fall from the life of pure reason in an earlier state of existence, it has been confined in the body as a prison, where it is subjected to the temptations of the flesh. If it resists these, it passes at death to the fellowship of the gods. If it succumbs, it is born again upon earth. If after repeated rebirths it does not reform, it is cast into Tartarus. This doctrine was well known to the Jews in Alexandria, and must have been accepted more or less extensively in Palestine. Wherever it was received men could believe that retribution occurred at death, and could try in one way or another to combine the Greek conception with the purely Jewish doctrine of resurrection.

The difficulty of all such combinations was that a judgment at death made a last judgment unnecessary; consequently there was no longer need for the dead to rise in order that they might receive the rewards of their deeds, and the tendency was strong to abandon the Jewish doctrine of resurrection in favor of the Greek doctrine of inherent immortality. This step was taken by the Jewish thinkers in Alexandria and by certain schools of thought in Palestine.

5. *The theory of retribution without resurrection.*—The Book of Wisdom never mentions a resurrection, but teaches exclusively the Platonic doctrine of immortality. "God created man for incorruption, and made him an image of his own being" (2:23). Birth is a fall from a higher existence (7:3), in which the soul receives a body in accordance with its deserts in a previous life (8:20). The body is a clog upon the immortal spirit (9:15), and death is a blessed release from imprisonment (4:7-15). The righteous pass at death to an immediate reward (1:15; 3:2 f.; 4:7, 10, 13), but the wicked are punished with eternal torments (2:24; 3:18; 4:18 f.). The same view meets us in IV Macc. 5:37; 7:3, 19; 9:8; 13:17; 14:5 f.; 15:3; 16:13; 17:5, 12; 18:16, 23. The patriarchs and other saints dwell with God, and are joined at death by the righteous, particularly by martyrs for the faith. A similiar belief was held by Philo, and by the Essenes, if we may trust the testimony of Josephus (*Ant.*, xviii, 1:5; *War*, ii, 8:11).

It is possible that the doctrine of immortality without resurrection is taught in a few psalms of the late Greek period. Thus in Ps. 16:9-11 we read: "Thou dost not commit me to Sheol, nor sufferest thy faithful ones to see the pit. Thou teachest me the pathway of life; in thy presence is fulness of joys, fair gifts are in thy right hand forever"; Ps. 17:15: "I, who am righteous, shall look on thy face, and shall be refreshed at (thine?) awakening, with a vision of thee"; Ps. 49:13-15: "This is their fate, who are full of self-confidence, and the end of those in whose speech men take pleasure. Like sheep unresisting they are cast down to Sheol, death is their herdsman, their form soon falls to decay, Sheol is become their dwelling. God alone can redeem my life from the hand of Sheol when it seizes me"; Ps. 73:23-26: "Yet do I stay by thee ever, thou holdest my right hand fast, thou leadest me according to thy counsel, and takest me

by the hand after thee. Whom have I in heaven? Whom beside thee do I care for on earth? My body and my heart pass away, but the rock of my heart and my portion is God evermore.”⁷ In these passages it is doubtful whether an individual speaks, or the nation; and, if it be an individual, whether the redemption from Sheol means more than that one is kept from death.⁸ The probability is that none of these utterances refer to a survival of the individual after death. In that case the Greek doctrine of immortality is not found in any of the writings that have been admitted to the Old Testament canon. The Hebrew doctrine of resurrection and the Greek doctrine of immortality existed side by side in Jewish thought at the beginning of the Christian era, and no satisfactory method of harmonizing them was devised.

6. *The theory of the Sadducees.*—The various attempts to solve the problem of retribution by projecting rewards and punishments into the other life found only a partial acceptance among the Jews during the centuries preceding the Christian era. A large party remained satisfied with the negative teaching of the Prophets and the Law, and with Ezekiel’s doctrine of individual retribution in the present life. This position is represented in the Old Testament by Ecclesiastes (about 200 B.C.). Its author knows that theories of immortality are current, but he rejects them as unproved: “Who knows the spirit of the sons of men, whether it ascends upward, and the spirit of beasts, whether it descends downward to the earth?” (Eccles. 3:21); “The dead know not anything, neither have they any more a reward. . . . There is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom in Sheol whither thou goest” (9:5 f., 10). Sheol is the “eternal house” (12:5). A similar skepticism appears in Ps. 88:10: “Wilt thou for the dead work a wonder? Will shades arise to render thee thanks? Do they tell in the grave of thy goodness? Of thy faithfulness in the world down below? Can thy wonders be made known in the darkness? and thy righteousness in the land of oblivion?”

Ecclesiasticus also believes neither in resurrection nor in immortality. Rewards and punishments are distributed in the present life

⁷ These passages are all quoted from the revised text and version of Wellhausen.

⁸ See *Biblical World*, March, 1910, 170 f.

(11:26 f.). Activity ceases in Sheol (17:27). It is eternal rest (30:17). Tobit and I Maccabees occupy the same position. Enoch (103:5 f.) denounces those who say: "Blessed are the sinners, they have seen good all their life long. Now they have died in prosperity and riches; they have seen no trouble and no shedding of blood in their life. They have died in glory, and judgment was not executed upon them in their lifetime." This was the doctrine of the priestly party of the Sadducees over against the Pharisees (Mark 12:18-27; Acts 23:8). They were right in claiming that resurrection was not found in the Law or the Prophets, but they were wrong in rejecting it for that reason. They were an instance of arrested religious development. The pre-exilic doctrine of Sheol they preserved in a petrified form, regardless of the fact that great movements of thought had occurred that rendered that doctrine no longer tenable.

From this survey it appears that in the time of Christ some of the Jews had outgrown the eschatology of the Prophets and the Law and believed in a life after death, either through resurrection, or through a continuation of the soul's powers in the other world. No clear conceptions had, however, been attained, and many remained skeptical on the whole subject. A new revelation was needed to clarify thought. Fresh light must be thrown upon the nature of God, the nature of man, and their relation to one another before the problem of immortality could be solved. That light came in Him, through whose life, and teaching, and rising again from the dead, life and immortality have been brought to light.